

REMARKS

Applicants have carefully studied the outstanding Official Action. The present response is intended to be fully responsive to all points of rejection raised by the Examiner and is believed to place the application in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and allowance of the application is respectfully requested.

The application as examined includes claims 27-63.

Claims 27-47, 53 and 57-63 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sernet (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0032632) in view of Ginter (U.S. Patent No. 5,892,900).

Claims 48-52 and 54-56 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sernet in view of Ginter and in further view of Cornelius (U.S. Patent No. 6,629,081).

Sernet describes an online trading system which includes a Bid/Offer input interface for allowing users to enter the terms of bids or offers for posting in the system anonymously, a Trading summary interface operable by users for displaying anonymous postings of bids and offers and for identifying a match of a bid and a counterpart offer, a Bid/Offer database for storing and retrieving data records of bids and offers submitted to the system, and a Bid/Offer interface for allowing a user to retrieve the data record for a selected bid or offer and change or modify one or more terms thereof and submit the countered or modified bid or offer as a new posting in the system without identification of the user.

Ginter describes systems and methods for electronic commerce including secure transaction management and electronic rights protection.

Cornelius describes a system and method for account settlement utilizing a network.

With reference to the plurality of queues recited in claim 27, the Examiner cites paragraph [0013] of Sernet, which reads: "In a preferred embodiment of the online trading system, the Bid/Offer input interface allows entry for a large number of terms typical of commodities contracts, such as stock type, quantity, price, shipping terms, delivery date, delivery location,

payment terms, etc...”.

In the context of the present application, a queue is defined as a sequence of items waiting in order for electronic action, as provided in paragraph [0157] of the application as published, which reads: “The queue manager 1000 manages a plurality of interrelated queues which typically exist in the system, each including a sequence of items waiting in order for electronic action. The queues are interrelated in the sense that priorities and requirements in one queue are affected by the management of at least one other queue”. Additionally, paragraphs [0160]-[0164] of the present application describe queues each including a specific category of actions, such as storage, shipping etc, and each queue including items relating to multiple transactions taking place in the system.

As quoted above, Sernet describes the ability to enter multiple terms of typical commodity contracts, such as shipping and payment terms, for each contract. However, Sernet does not show or suggest that terms of a specific category belonging to different contracts are grouped together in a queue, which queue includes a sequence of items waiting in order for electronic action as defined in the present application.

Ginter describes multiple types of queues including a service interrupt queue, a run queue, a swap queue and a sleep queue (column 115, lines 12-38), as well as an event queue and a service queue (column 119 line 44 to column 121 line 25 and column 123 line 63 to column 124 line 38). However, each of these queues includes computerized tasks to be carried out in sequence, and are not sorted according to the nature of the required tasks with respect to transactions being carried out.

Thus, applicant respectfully submits that none of the prior art of record shows or suggests a plurality of queues including at least two of a storage queue, a shipment queue, a currency exchange queue, a credit/debit note queue and an invoice queue, as recited in claim 27 of the present application and as defined in the body of the present application.

Accordingly, independent claim 27 is deemed patentable over the prior art of record and favorable reconsideration is respectfully requested. Claims 28-63 depend directly or ultimately from

the above mentioned independent claim and recite additional patentable subject matter and therefore are deemed patentable.

In view of the foregoing remarks, all of the claims are believed to be in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and allowance of the application is respectfully requested.

Dated: February 18, 2009

Respectfully submitted,

By 

S. Peter Ludwig

Registration No.: 25,351

DARBY & DARBY P.C.

P.O. Box 770

Church Street Station

New York, New York 10008-0770

(212) 527-7700

(212) 527-7701 (Fax)

Attorneys/Agents For Applicant